

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/699,347	10/31/2003	Xiaochun Li	539.005	2522	
	90 01/31/200 ICKSON NEWHOL N	•	EXAMINER		
BOYLE FREDRICKSON NEWHOLM STEIN & GRATZ, S.C. 250 E. WISCONSIN AVENUE			EVANS, GEOFFREY S		
SUITE 1030 MILWAUKEE, '	WI 53202		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
1725					
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MON	THS	01/31/2007	PAF	PER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	·	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<u>~</u>		
Office Action Summary		10/699,347	LI, XIAOCHUN			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Geoffrey S. Evans	1725			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	ATE OF THIS COMMUNI: 36(a). In no event, however, may a rivil apply and will expire SIX (6) MON, cause the application to become Al	CATION. eply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communic BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status				٠.		
2a)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.	• •	s is		
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers					
	The specification is objected to by the Examine			•		
10)	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		•			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment	r(s)	•				
2) Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 20051024	Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application 			

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. The information disclosure statement filed 24 October 2005 has not had its foreign references considered because complete copies have not been supplied as required under 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2).
- 2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 1,2, and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Yamazaki in Japan Patent No. 2001-178,434. Yamazaki discloses using the third harmonic of a YAG laser (see paragraph 36), which has a known wavelength of 354 nm, to ablate (see paragraph 11) the skin of a potato. Yamazaki further discloses controlling the focus spot size to have a linear shape.
- 4. Claims 1-3,9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by O'Neill in U.S. Patent No. 6,394,889. O'Neill discloses using a pulsed excimer laser to ablate fatty connecting tissue of an animal (see column 7,lines 15-20). O'Neill further

Application/Control Number: 10/699,347

Art Unit: 1725

discloses controlling the depth of the ablation based upon the power level (see column 7,lines 16-18).

Page 3

- 5. Claims 1-3,7,9-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by L'Esperance, Jr. in U.S. Patent No. 5,312,320. L'Esperance, Jr. teaches using a laser beam with UV radiation equal to 266 nm (see column 7,line 11) that can be used for laser ablation of an organic material (an eye), which is therefore considered capable of ablating a food product. The irradiated flux density is controlled to achieve the desired depth of cut (e.g. see abstract). L'Esperance, Jr. discloses using a pulsed laser (see column 4,lines 27-40). Regarding claim 22, the workpiece of claim 22 (an eye) is considered to be food, at least to man-eating animals, flesh eating bacteria and cannibals.
- 6. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kliewer et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,572,606. Kliewer discloses a laser that generates ultraviolet radiation (see column 6,line 17), selecting focus spot size (see column 7,lines 3-10), radiation pulse repetition rate (see column 6,lines 17-18), and laser beam power (see column 7,lines 11-22) to photoablate an eye. An eye is considered to be food.
- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/699,347

Art Unit: 1725

- 8. Claims 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over L'Esperance, Jr. in U.S. Patent No. 5,312,320 in view of Morris et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,472,295. Morris et al. teaches selecting the repetition rate (pulse rate) to achieve the desired cut rate and depth (see column 3, lines 52-55). It would have been obvious to adapt L'Esperance, Jr. in view of Morris et al. to control the pulse rate to achieve the desired cut rate.
- 9. Claims 5,6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over L'Esperance, Jr. in U.S. Patent No. 5,312,320 in view of Oikawa et al. in Japan Patent No. 10-249,571. Oikawa et al. teaches changing the machining depth by adjusting the processing speed. It would have been obvious to adapt L'Esperance, Jr. in view of Oikawa et al. to provide this to change the machining speed to adjust a processing characteristic (i.e. machining depth). Regarding claim 8, L'Esperance, Jr. discloses using a laser beam with UV radiation equal to 266 nm (see column 7,line 11).
- 10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Luigi in EP 685,154 laser marks cheese. O'Brien et al. in U.S. Patent No. 5,334,084 in column 16,lines 12-14 discloses using an excimer laser to laser cut an animal carcass.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Geoffrey S Evans whose telephone number is (571)-272-1174. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 6:30AM to 4:00 PM, alternate Fridays off.

Application/Control Number: 10/699,347

Art Unit: 1725

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Pat Ryan can be reached on (571)-272-1292. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)-872-9306.

GSE

Geoffrey S. Evans
Primary Examiner

Page 5

Group 1700